



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

without allowance of a simple affusion in case of need, was practiced in the church. But Christian institutions in the middle of the second century, and much more at its end, were not the unaltered institutions of the apostolic age. In these circumstances we shall welcome any further line of investigation which promises to throw light on our problem. Such light it might seem would be found in the relation of Christian baptism to what is known as proselyte baptism or the rabbinical custom of initiating proselytes into the Jewish faith by a formal and complete immersion. But proselyte baptism was apparently a growth of the second century after Christ, and this line of inquiry is profitless. The archæological inquiry as to the mode of Christian baptism leaves us hanging, therefore, in the middle of the second century. Where, then, are we to go for knowledge of really primitive baptism? If the archæology of the rite supplies ground for no very safe inference, where can we obtain satisfactory guidance? Apparently only from the New Testament itself. We are seemingly shut up to the hints and implications of the sacred pages for trustworthy information here. But the conclusions to which these hints and implications would conduct us it is not the purpose of this article even to suggest.

This will be to many an unsatisfactory conclusion. It is not questioned by fair-minded scholars that very early in the history of the Christian church differences arose in the administration of the act of baptism. They were to be expected in connection with the growth of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. But no such differences are discoverable in the New Testament. Indeed so clear and definite is its teaching that historians of every name—Mosheim, Thiersch, Venema, Guericke, Bunsen, Schaff, Pressensé, Kurtz, Stanley, Döllinger—and New Testament interpreters in the various branches of the Christian church—Fritzsche, de Wette, Olshausen, Alford, Lange, Meyer, Tholuck, Lightfoot—have declared that the act of baptism in New Testament times was immersion and not affusion. It is to be wished, therefore, that Dr. Warfield had pursued his inquiries a little further and laid before us not merely the hints and implications but the clear testimony of the New Testament documents with reference to the primitive act of baptism. Perhaps he purposes to do this in another paper.

PORTLAND, MAINE.

HENRY S. BURRAGE.

DAS TODESJAHR AGRIPPA'S II, DES LETZTEN JÜDISCHEN KÖNIGS. VON CARL ERBES; *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, Vol. 39, Heft 3, pp. 415-435.

ONE of the disputed points of chronology in the New Testament times is the date of the death of Agrippa II. In spite of the difficulties

which attend a solution of the problem, Schürer has ventured (*Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, Div. I, Vol. II, pp. 205, 206) to say: "According to the testimony of Justus of Tiberias, Agrippa died in the third year of Trajan, in A. D. 100; and there is no reason for doubting the correctness of this statement, as Tillemont and many modern writers have done." Notwithstanding this confident statement, Erbes has given in the above article an extended argument for assigning the death of Agrippa II to an earlier year, namely, the year 86 A. D. He introduces a piece of evidence "hitherto wholly overlooked" which comes from a much earlier time than the testimony of Photius (containing the supposed testimony of Justus of Tiberias referred to by Schürer), and which he thinks is sufficient to settle the question for the earlier date.

The "Weltchronik vom Jahre 334," which was published by Mommsen in 1850 (I. Band der *Abhandlungen der philol.-histor. Classe der königl. sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*) gives a series of figures out of which the following table of periods and dates is constructed: From the creation of the world until Cyrus was 4916 years; the Jews were under the Persians 230 years; the Jews were under the Macedonians 270 years; the Jews were under their own kings until Agrippa II, 345 years; from Agrippa until 194 A. D. (reckoned back from 334 A. D. by data given) is 109 years, leaving 86 A. D. as the date of his death. The numbers thus discovered receive confirmation also from other sources.

The testimony of the coins to the limits of Agrippa's reign is by no means clear; Mommsen is correct in saying that the year numbers on the coins of Agrippa II present one of the most perplexing numismatic problems. But from Mommsen's arrangement of the coins of this period Erbes finds evidence that the reign of Agrippa extended up to but not beyond the year 86 A. D., a conclusion at which de Saulcy had already arrived (*Numism. de la Terre Sainte*, p. 316).

It is argued also with much plausibility that the *Antiquities* of Josephus presuppose the death of Agrippa, and their date we know to be 93 or 94 A. D. For Josephus at an earlier time was on good terms with Agrippa, who read and praised for its trustworthiness portions of the *Wars of the Jews* while Josephus was preparing it; this work was completed under Vespasian. But when we come to the *Antiquities* Josephus has various statements concerning Agrippa which he could hardly have introduced if Agrippa had been alive at the time they

were written, *e. g.*, his charging the whole Jewish-Roman War to the permission given the Levites by Agrippa to wear linen garments like the priests (*Ant.* 20, 9, 6), and his very unpalatable although true comments upon the private character of Agrippa and his sisters (*Ant.* 20, 7, 2, 3).

The death of Agrippa of course took place before the publication of Josephus' *Life*. Erbes agrees with Schürer that the *Life* was a sort of appendix to the *Antiquities*, but argues against Schürer that the *Life* must have followed the *Antiquities* within a year, for Justus of Tiberias had already had his account of the *Jewish War* written for twenty years and he would not have lost time in publishing it after Josephus' *Antiquities* appeared with its misrepresentations. Then Josephus would have immediately followed up Justus' work with his *Life* in which he made himself out to be, not the chief organizer in Galilee of the forces of the rebellion as Justus truly represented him, but as the constant and faithful friend of the Romans. The *Life* presumably then belongs to 94 or 95 A. D.

The statement of the patriarch Photius in the second half of the ninth century, on the alleged authority of Justus, that Agrippa died in the third year of Trajan, *i. e.*, in 100 A. D., must therefore be a mistake. Several explanations could be given of how such an error might easily have been made. In any case its testimony is not sufficient to set aside the conclusions arrived at by the above presentation of data.

C. W. VOTAW.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DIE HIMMELFAHRT DES JESAJA, EIN ÄLTESTES ZEUGNIS FÜR DAS RÖMISCHE MARTYRIUM DES PETRUS. VON CARL CLEMEN; *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, Vol. 39, Heft 3, pp. 388-415.

AN Ethiopic translation of the *Ascension of Isaiah*, an early Jewish-Christian book, was discovered in 1819. Since that time the book has been found also in Latin, and critics have usually discussed it from the standpoint of the Latin version, as Clemen does in the article before us. All recent critics hold that it contains two or more original documents by different authors, which some editor has joined together.

As the title of his paper shows, Clemen is concerned with but a single aspect of the book, the testimony to the martyrdom of the apos-